

**BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY**

Meeting Date: June 15, 2005

Division: County Administrator

Bulk Item: Yes ☐ No ☒

Department: County Administrator

Staff Contact Person: Debbie Frederick

AGENDA ITEM WORDING: Discussion of recent Dade County Commission actions regarding the proposed annexation of property by Florida City and expansion of the Urban Development Boundary (UDB).

ITEM BACKGROUND: At the BOCC meeting of March 16, 2005, the Board adopted Resolution No. 107-2005, calling on Miami-Dade Board of County Commissioner to oppose any extension to the Urban Development Boundary, to encourage infill development and adherence to the Miami-Dade County Development Master Plan as currently adopted, including the Adopted 2003 Evaluation and Appraisal Report, providing an effective date.

PREVIOUS RELEVANT BOCC ACTION: Same as above.

CONTRACT/AGREEMENT CHANGES:

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

TOTAL COST: -0-

BUDGETED: Yes ☐ No ☐

COST TO COUNTY: _____

SOURCE OF FUNDS: _____

REVENUE PRODUCING: Yes ☐ No ☐ **AMOUNT PER MONTH** _____ **Year** _____

APPROVED BY: County Atty ☐ OMB/Purchasing ☐ Risk Management ☐

DIVISION DIRECTOR APPROVAL: Thomas J. Willi
(TYPE NAME HERE)

DOCUMENTATION: Included ☐ Not Required ☒

DISPOSITION: _____

AGENDA ITEM # _____

From: McGarry-Tim

Sent: Friday, June 10, 2005 4:40 PM

To: BOCCDIS1; BOCCDIS2; BOCCDIS3; BOCCDIS4; BOCCDIS5

Cc: Collins-John; Frederick-Debbie; Willi-Tom

Subject: Update on Miami-Dade County Commission Action on Florida City Annexation

Commissioners,

As you are probably all aware by now, the Miami-Dade Commission voted 7-5 to approve the annexation boundary request of Florida City on Tuesday, June 7. This annexation request was approved despite recommendation of denial by the Miami-Dade County staff, which identified problems with possible expansion of growth into this currently mostly undeveloped portion of Miami-Dade County.

The County staff report cited that expansion of utilities and municipal services to this area and its subsequent development would be inconsistent with the County's Comprehensive Development Master Plan. Furthermore, until the South Miami-Dade Watershed Study and other related studies were completed, it would be premature to make any decisions affecting future development in that area of the County.

Florida City claimed that it would not change the current zoning of the property (1 unit per 5 acres) and that it needed the additional acreage to expand its tax base and possibly preempt the City of Homestead from annexing the area in the future.

Approximately 40 minutes was provided to each side (pro and con) to present their arguments. The con side had 35 speakers, including a representative each from Monroe County, City of Marathon, and Village of Islamorada, who voiced concerns or spoke against the annexation.

Miami-Dade Mayor Alvarez has indicated that he may veto the action of the Commission. He has 10 days to do so. As it requires 9 votes to override the veto, it is unlikely that a veto would be overridden based on the initial vote. The staff has asked Miami-Dade staff about whether or not another public hearing would be necessary for the County Commission to consider overriding the veto should the Mayor take such action; we have not yet received an answer to this question.

As of this date, the application for Development of Regional Impact for the Florida City project has not been submitted to the South Florida Regional Planning Council. It is anticipated that the application for expansion of the Urban Development Boundary will be submitted at a future date by Florida City, if the annexation is approved. To be approved, the Florida City DRI would require expansion of the Urban Development Boundary.

The Board of County Commissioners may want to discuss the County's continued response to the annexation, DRI, and UDB boundary issues at its June 15, 2005, meeting. As local municipalities in the County are also very concerned about the potential impacts of these issues on the Florida Keys, it may be the opportune time for the Board to discuss the desirability of coordinating our efforts with these municipalities to form a collective response. I would be happy to bring this item up for discussion during my Growth Management report unless a Commissioner or the County Administrator would like to separately agenda the item.

Should you have any questions or need further information, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Tim McGarry